

GTA Board Meeting Minutes

April 23, 2012

County Square, 301 University Ridge, Greenville, SC
Conference Room H (Bauer)**Board Members in Attendance:**

Mr. Matt Carter
Ms. Pat Dilger
Mr. Trey Fouché, Asst. Chairman
Mr. David Mitchell, Chairman
Mr. Jason Tankersley
Mr. Jan Williams

Staff in Attendance:

Greg Baney, Planner/Grants Manager
Dave Baxter, Program Coordinator-JARC
Lorrie Brown, Administrative Assistant
Phil Robey, Interim Transit Director/OMB Director
Shelia Schmitt, Transit General Manager

Others in Attendance:

Keith Brockington, GPATS Planner
Karen Crawford, City Comptroller
Warren Rowe, City Projects Manager

Absent Board Members

Mr. Al Gray, Treasurer

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 noon by Mr. David Mitchell, Chairman.

Quorum established.

Approval of March 26, 2012 Board Meeting Minutes:

A motion to approve the March 26, 2012 Board Meeting Minutes was made by Mr. Jan Williams. The motion was seconded by Mr. David Mitchell. No opposers. The motion carries.

Updates and New Business

- **Greenlink/GTA Budget** – Mr. Robey stated that the Budget was not discussed due to time constraints. It will be put on the May Agenda.
- **Highway Transportation Legislation** – The House passed a 90 day extension on the current Transportation law. The Senate is working on their version of a multi-year legislation. Staff will provide an update at the next meeting.
- **Marketing Plan (PowerPoint Presentation by Greg Baney):** Mr. Baney thanked Dave Baxter for putting together the Marketing Plan which is a very aggressive plan for the next five years.

The questions he will address in his presentation are: 1) Why market public transportation? 2) What is the outcome? 3) Who will we target? 4) When will it occur? 5) How will it happen?

Why Market Public Transportation?**Two Goals**

- Goal 1: Short-term (one to five years) financial solvency through building public and private partnerships enabling GTA/Greenlink to remain financially solvent over the next 60 months while working simultaneously on goal 2.
- Goal 2: Long-term (five years and beyond) financial sustainability goal.

Four Objectives with these two goals:

- Objective 1: Raise Public Awareness – There was a survey in the Transit Vision and Master Plan completed in 2010 which polled Greenville County voters, and 85% of those polled never used public transportation. This was a random scientific survey of Greenville County voters.
- Objective 2: Develop Public/Private Partnerships
- Objective 3: Improve Ridership Experience (Entails making service more accessible by reducing headway and services such as CAD/AVL to enhance service)
- Objective 4: Obtain dedicated funding

What is the outcome?

- Increased public support for multi-modal public transportation. By building on public and private sector relationships we can increase public support for multimodal public transportation. This encompasses seeing public transportation as more than just riding the bus. Cyclists are an example of this.
- Expanded service area from Traveler's Rest in the north to Fountain Inn in the southeast and Clemson in the west to GSP in the east. Some of these relationships are currently being built. A relationship was started with Travelers Rest through the previous TR shuttle, and we are reaching out to some potential partners in TR in order to eventually have a connector shuttle which will connect to Route 3 and provide a seamless transportation with our current Greenlink network from Travelers Rest to Fountain Inn. Then do something similar from Clemson to GSP.
- Short-term revenue increase without seeking additional appropriations from the City & County (deriving from public/private partnerships that exchange targeted service for annual apportionments).
- Publicizing the Greenlink brand. Having the Greenlink brand mean different things to different people is part of what the marketing plan targets. For a cyclist associating Greenlink with a bike locker or bike rental program can become as instrumental in getting public support as a bus rider associating Greenlink with the bus system.

- Creation of a public/private coalition of partners that will assist in developing enough local support for a dedicated funding source by FY2017. This is the backbone of the Marketing Plan. As a public entity, the City of Greenville, GTA and the Board is limited in our ability to secure a dedicated funding source in the next 60 months. The cooperation of both public and private entities which are identified in the plan as the Upstate Transit Coalition (a group of individuals who have a vested interest in public transportation and multi modal transportation) is going to be essential. They would share our vision and know what public transportation in Greenville County is and what it could be with enough public support and enough funding.

Who will we target?

There are several demographics we consider to be primary stakeholders and secondary stakeholders. The distinction between primary and secondary stakeholders is that a primary stakeholder is one who directly benefits from the service. Secondary are those who are involved with our service because of positive externality, indirectly benefit, and also have a large stake in our service. The primary groups we have identified to target are 1) Students and Universities 2) Professionals who are persons who choose to ride and do not have to ride public transportation 3) Hispanics –The 2010 census showed a 146% increase in Greenville County and not one individual polled said they use public transportation. Finding out the road blocks to this particular demographic is one thing this marketing plan will enable us to do and be able to target this group. All of these groups are people we want to use our system and do so in limited numbers. In our Title VI Plan we identified barriers to the Hispanic population in riding the bus system. The Title VI plan uses census data. 4) The Elderly 5) Disabled and 6) Cyclists and 7) Tourists/Visitors. These are groups that are using our system to some extent.

The secondary stakeholders are the persons who interact with primary stakeholders and see the benefit of transportation. They are: 1) Major employers - We can target them mostly through a commuter program; we need to help them see the benefit of transit and offer it to their employees. We have to be able to address the hindrances such as head way. This probably will not occur until after dedicated funding is obtained. 2) Property Developers – If they understand the benefits for transit oriented development and the power public transportation plays in the growth of a community they can become a stakeholder and supporter. 3) Elected Officials/Voters – The survey conducted by the Spiro group in the Transit Vision and Master Plan looked at only registered voters. Out of 500 registered voters 85% polled said they never used public transportation; this tells us we are not targeting people who vote and elected officials. 4) The media – they can be either friend or foe.

When will it occur?

Marketing Milestones:

1. Implementation of Mauldin/Simpsonville Route -10/01/2012
2. Implementation of CAD/AVL Phase II-10/01/2012 - When the timeline was created we thought there might be a phase II or III. The Timeline is not written in stone. Phase II addresses service enhancements.
3. Create Upstate Transit Coalition -10/01/2012 - We have already begun to identify this group of people that have a vested interest in working with public transportation in Greenville County who we can rely on to carry the vision forward and aggressively pursue a dedicated funding source. Their one goal is to obtain a local dedicated funding source by FY2017. We work in tandem with them so that by January 1, 2015 we will have enough incremental improvements, and partnerships have been developed both in Mauldin and Simpsonville, Travelers Rest and Fountain Inn; so that the number of county wide stakeholders has increased to the point where we can work with our Upstate Coalition to have them aggressively do a marketing campaign leading up to November 2016.
4. Downtown Lunch Trolley Service, Clemson Express Bus Service begins 1/01/2013
5. Traveler's Rest Shuttle Service, Furman Shuttle projected to begin 7/01/2013
6. GSP Express Service Begins 10/01/2013

Mr. Carter suggested having a transitional statement which states based on your input we developed the Transit Vision and Master Plan and now we are taking steps to market and implement that plan. Mr. Baney stated that we took things from the Transit Vision and Master Plan and put it in a five year process.

How will it happen?

- Creation and development of public/private partnerships – This is what the Upstate Transit Coalition will champion.
- Creation and development of an Upstate Transit Coalition; a group of both public and private partners who have one mission (proposing that they meet quarterly): Main objective is to market and obtain a dedicated local funding source for public transportation by FY2017.

The Marketing Plan has two bookends: 1) Short-term financial solvency revolves around partnerships in the next five years. 2) Long-term financial sustainability is after a dedicated funding source is obtained; it is what we are able to do as a result of the increased revenue.

Questions and Answers:

- Mr. Carter asked when tracking implementation, if there was a way to include the Board upon implementation as necessary and putting a cost to the implementation as we go along. Mr. Baney stated that the milestones have a date of activity and he recommends moving forward that it be incorporated into the monthly Development Committee Meetings in order to keep track of the project and the cost associated with specific marketing tasks. Tasks come from each objective

that has been identified. He would recommend that the Board as a governing body be kept abreast of whether things are moving forward and the success of the actions or whether things have slowed down. Most of the activity for the first five years will be done with minimal cost.

- With the exception of targeting the demographic groups, we are focusing on partnerships which are self-sustaining. There are small incremental steps that we can take to reach out to the seven groups without it costing a lot in the short term. When putting the plan together, we looked at the St. Louis Transit Alliance which was a non-profit created to get a tax referendum passed in St. Louis. They were incorporated separately and had the ability to raise funding. He recommends that this be a role of the Upstate Transit Coalition; whether they become incorporated is optional. He recommends that they have a separate bank account and raise support to fund the short-term marketing tasks and also the long-term marketing campaign.
- Mr. Mitchell stated that the marketing plan should be a working document for both committees but remain primarily in the Development Committee. He feels we need to move some timelines up depending upon priorities. Mr. Baney stated the dates are not laid in stone.
- Mr. Carter stated that looking at the document it could be interpreted that everything leads up to a BRT. He recommended saying it differently. Mr. Baney stated the document was created as a working document for staff in order to report to the Board. Mr. Carter stated that dedicated funding source should be the end goal.
- Ms. Dilger stated that in order to get a referendum we must show the public that it is not expenditure; it is an investment and there will be return on investment which will benefit everyone by way of economic development, federal highway attainment, air quality, etc. We need to document the advantages. The public needs to know that we have some ideas on how to address the sprawl issue and headway time. A lot of this is contained in the BRT Corridor we are looking at.
- Mr. Baney stated that what is in the marketing plan is consistent with what is in our Transit Vision and Master Plan. No new transit component was added.

▪ **Request for Board Action to approve the Marketing Plan and adopt it as policy** - Approval of the Marketing Plan would authorize staff to implement the strategies detailed therein and assist staff with the implementation of the Plan where reasonable and necessary.

A motion was made by Mr. David Mitchell to adopt the Marketing Plan presented to the Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trey Fouché. No opposers. The motion carries.

Chairman Mitchell stated that Mr. Jan Williams has a recommendation relative to the GTA Bylaws. Mr. Williams stated due to the way that Board members vote at board meetings, items can pass without the majority of the Board voting to pass it. The full board number is seven, and he proposes that we go by board majority which would mean that we would require four votes in order to pass a recommendation if requested by any Board Member. He stated that the bylaws state that Board members can vote by proxy. Mr. Mitchell has asked that this go through the Development Committee before coming back to the full Board. Mr. Carter stated that at some Board meetings we only had four board members show up and if we require a majority of full board to approve recommendations, this could pose a problem in getting bills paid, etc. He stated that the majority of things should be able to be done with majority of attendees; however, there are some things that should only be done with approval of the full board as outlined in the Bylaws.

Committee Reports

Development Committee Report (Given by Mr. Trey Fouché):

- We will have new artwork on back wall of the Transit Center and a mural at 106 Augusta Street (outside windows) which was donated. There will be eight panels along the back wall of the Transit Center. We will pay for supplies. Greg Baney stated we do not have a line item for the artwork at Transfer Center; therefore, we will be doing it under furniture and graphics which is reimbursable at 80/20. We only have one grant left that deals with the Transit Center. The only line item we can use for the supplies is under furniture and graphics. The match has to be specified in the grant. The artwork will be the property of GTA.
- Non-profit tickets were discussed and how to limit abuse of these tickets. We are looking at purchasing tokens.
- Wi-Fi is working at the Transit Center, and Clear Talk is working to have it up and running on the buses.
- The City has decided that the money from the hospitality fund they are using to operate the trolley could not be legitimately transferred to GTA. Therefore GTA will not run the downtown trolley. We are still looking at doing a circulator route which is in our Transit Vision and Master Plan and in the marketing plan.

Finance Committee Report (Given by Mr. Matt Carter): February was not a good month for us, but we are now on target for our budget. RouteMatch invoices enclosed are for phase I of CAD/AVL project. Budget bumped to the next meeting.

The Finance Committee recommends approval of total invoices in the amount of \$541,864.11 (\$535,303.11 regular invoices and \$6,561.00 JARC/New Freedom Invoices) pending availability of funds. A second is not required since this is a recommendation from the Finance Committee. A vote is taken. There are no opposers. The recommendation carries.

April 2012 GTA Finance Board Invoices

Date	Company	Description	Invoice #	Amount
3/22/2012	City of Greenville	GTA Board Contract-February 2012	74136	264,086.68
3/27/2012	Brasco International	25 Bus Shelters plus replacement glass (15 ea.)	44175	188,225.00
3/19/2012	David Mitchell	Board Member Training Mileage Reimbursement	n/a	286.77
3/31/2012	LS3P Neal Prince	Phase 3 – Bike Station	26691	656.75
2/24/2012	RouteMatch Software	CA License Fees	10444	52,000.00
2/24/2012	RouteMatch Software	AVL/MDC License Fees	10445	12,500.00
4/10/2012	TD Bank	Hilton Hotel – TASC Training for D. Mitchell	n/a	354.91
4/5/2012	Victor Stanley Inc.	20 ea. Dome Lidded 36 gal. Trash Receptacle	22338	17,193.00
Total				\$535,303.11

JARC/New Freedom Invoices

Date	Company	Description	Invoice #	Amount
4/10/2012	Bon Secours St. Francis	Operations Reimbursement Oct – Nov 2011	Transit 10-11	\$4,746.00
3/26/2012	Miracle Hill Ministries	Operations Costs Reimbursement Jan-Mar 2012		\$1,815.00
Total				\$6,561.00

Grand Total

\$541,864.11

- 1 The invoice relates to various items, applicable portion grant funded, GTA responsible for 20%.
- 2 The invoice relates to JARC/New Freedom grant
- 3 The invoice relates to the Transit Center Renovation project, 80% grant funds, local match provided by City.
- 4 Board expense – no federal funding applies
- 5 The invoice relates to bus purchase/implicit payment, restricted cash available
- 6 the invoice relates to CAD/AVL grant, 80% grant funds, local match provided by City.

The Finance Committee recommends not pursuing Phase II of the CAD/AVL plan at this time due to attempts to maintain a healthy reserve. Phase I is the operations component which the committee is recommending for approval. The match associated with Phase I is a little over \$36,000. The match associated with Phase II is a little over \$68,000. Ms. Schmitt stated that doing Phase I will help us, since it deals with Paratransit and that we should see savings due to this system. We just won't have the bells and whistles for the passengers. It will focus on programming (NTD reports). Paratransit scheduling should be more accurate.

The Finance Committee recommends approval of only Phase I of the RouteMatch CAD/AVL Program to the full Board pending review of the contract by the City Legal Department. This is the operations component which will cost approximately \$180,000. Since this is a recommendation from the Finance Committee, a second is not required. No opposers. The recommendation passes.

The Finance Committee recommends implementing a token system which will require the purchase of tokens. The cost to purchase recommended amount of tokens is around \$5,000. Since this is a recommendation from the Finance Committee, a second is not required. No opposers. The recommendation passes.

A report was given by Scott McIver regarding maintenance of buses prior to and after the purchase of the new buses based on 2010 expenses versus 2011/2012 expenses. The new buses are saving us money. We will continue to track this for the next few years to see if we can justify replacing buses on a program vs. when they fall apart.

Management Report: Phil Robey stated that he shared the impact of the 2010 Census with the Development Committee relative to the definition of the Greenville urbanized area and the potential impact it will have on the Clemson Area Transportation. We know it will have an impact, but there is a lot we do not know in terms of the timeline of when the funding formula changes. It will have Clemson part of the Greenville Urbanized area, and there are ramifications for them. As developments come to light the board will be updated. They have spoken with the head of the Mass Transit section of SCDOT and they are waiting to hear as well. As they get info, they will share it with us.

A motion was made by Mr. Matt Carter to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Pat Dilger. No opposers. The motion carries.

Prepared by: Lorrie Brown Date: 4-23-12
 Lorrie Brown, Greenlink Administrative Assistant

Approved by: David C. Mitchell Date: 6-25-2012
 Mr. David Mitchell, GTA Board Chairman